

REMARKS

This is intended to be a complete response to the Official Action mailed April 16, 2004, in which claims 11-19, 22 and 23 were allowed, claims 3, 10, 20 and 21 were objected to, and claims 1-2, and 4-9 were rejected. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the claims but, in the interest of advancing prosecution of the case, have cancelled claims 1-10, 20 and 21 without prejudice as explained in further detail below. The cancelled claims will be the subject of a future continuation application.

Rejection under §103(a)

Claims 1, 2, 4-9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dai et al. article taken with Tohji article.

As noted above, applicants respectfully traverse the rejection but have cancelled the rejected claims without prejudice to advance the prosecution of the application. In particular, Dai et al., does not teach using a space velocity of $30,000\text{h}^{-1}$ or greater.

In view of the above, applicants respectfully request submit the rejection under §103(a) is now moot. The elements of claims 3, 10, 20 and 21 have been incorporated into new claims as explained below.

Amended and New Claims

Claim 11 has been amended to delete limitations that applicants deem unnecessary in view of the art, and to provide the full breadth of claim coverage of which the applicants believe they are deserving. In particular, the term "under elevated pressure" has been deleted from claim 11, the space velocity limitation has been removed, and the last step has been deleted as being unnecessary.

New claim 25 is similar to original claim 1 except the limitation of objected to claim 3 has been incorporated therewith.

New claims 26-35 are similar to claims 2, 4-10, 20 and 21, respectively, except they depend instead from claim 25. New claim 36 is like the last step deleted from claim 11. New claim 37 merely claims the product made from the process of claim 25.

New claim 38 is similar to original claim 1 except the limitation of objected to claim 10 has been incorporated therewith.

New claims 39-46 are similar to claims 2-8 and 20-21, respectively, except they depend instead from claim 38. New claim 48 is like the last step deleted from claim 11. New claim 49 merely claims the product made from the process of claim 38.

New claim 50 is similar to original claim 1 except the limitation of objected to claim 20 has been incorporated therewith.

New claims 51-60 are similar to claims 2-10 and 21, respectively, except they depend instead from claim 50. New claim 61 is like the last step deleted from claim 11. New claim 62 merely claims the product made from the process of claim 50.

Conclusion

In view of the above, applicants respectfully submit the claims are now in a condition for allowance and respectfully request issuance of a Notice of Allowance thereof.

Respectfully submitted,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Christopher W. Corbett", is written over a horizontal line.

Christopher W. Corbett,
Reg. No. 36,109
DUNLAP CODDING & ROGERS, P.C.
P.O. Box 16370
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73113
Telephone: (405) 607-8600
Facsimile: (405) 607-8686
Agent for Applicants)